

## **Remarks**

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed January 10, 2007 in which the Examiner objected to claims 1-17 in view of informalities regarding claims 1, 2, 3, 6 and 12, rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,219,431 to Proni (the “431 patent”) and objected to claims 3-17 as containing allowable subject matter but being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

In response, corrections have been made to claims 1, 2, 3, 6 and 12 as requested by the Examiner.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under §102, the cited reference is a patent invented by the same inventor as the present application and owned by the same assignee. It is concerned with a mounting arrangement for connecting the frame to the motor structure of a loudspeaker wherein a space is provided between the base of the frame and the top plate of the motor structure forming a flow path for the passage of cooling air along that interface. There is no discussion whatsoever in the ‘431 patent of forming the “moving assembly” of the such speaker, i.e. the upper and lower suspensions, the voice coil and the diaphragm, as a unit separate from the frame, and then connecting the moving assembly to the frame and to the motor structure as recited in claim 1 of the present application. As attested to by the attached Rule 1.132 Declaration of a Senior Research Engineer of the assignee, the loudspeaker disclosed in the ‘431 patent reference is made substantially in accordance with the prior art method of manufacture discussed at pages 2-4 of the specification. The Declaration further confirms that the moving assembly of the ‘431 patent is not formed as a unit separate from the frame, and then connected to the frame and to the motor structure.

Claim 2 is allowable for the same reasons as claim 1 noted above. Further, claim 2 recites that the upper flange of the frame is formed with a number of spaced surround locator holes (paragraph (ii)) which are not present in the ‘431 reference. Additionally, in the method of manufacture of the ‘431 reference the screws which connect the frame to the motor structure are not “loosely secured” to aligning mounting holes of those elements as called for in paragraph (iv) of claim 2.

In view of the amendments to claims 1, 2, 3, 6 and 12, the evidence provided in the attached Rule 1.132 Declaration and the argument given above, applicant considers

this case to be in a condition for allowance and respectfully requests earlier notification of same.

Respectfully submitted,

GrayRobinson, P.A.

By: Thomas L. Kautz  
Thomas L. Kautz, Reg. No. 28,726

**CUSTOMER No. 60474**

401 E. Las Olas Boulevard  
Suite 1850  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301  
(954) 761-7477